UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,599	01/02/2001	Jeffrey Taihana Tuatini	243768004US1	4896

25096   7590   07/09/2004

PERKINS COIE LLP
PATENT-SEA
P.O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER
COURTENAY III, ST JOHN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 January 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-69* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) *68* is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-21,24-46,49-63,66,67 and 69* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *22,23,47,48,64 and 65* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *6-11-01* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

ST. JOHN COURTENAY III
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

The Examiner requests that Applicant supply copies of all non patent literature listed on the Information Disclosure Statement (PTO-1449) received April 29, 2002 (paper #6). The original copies of the non patent literature were never electronically scanned by the PTO and are apparently lost and therefore not readily available to the Examiner for consideration as prior art.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-21, 24-46, 49-63, 66, 67 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by **Campagnoni** et al. (U.S. Patent 6,182,154).

As per independent claim 1:
Campagnoni teaches a method in a computer system for executing applications to communicate with remote shared service providers using multiple messaging models, each remote shared service provider having for each of the multiple messaging models a distinct associated proxy component able to

communicate with that remote shared service provider using that messaging model, the method comprising:

- under control of a first of the executing applications having a local messaging component able to communicate with each of the associated proxy components, notifying the local messaging component [i.e., proxy manager, col. 6] to send a specified first message to a specified first remote shared service provider using a specified first messaging model [e.g., see "Clients typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion]; and

- under control of the local messaging component, sending the first message to the first remote shared service provider using the first messaging model by, retrieving configuration information for the first remote shared service provider that identifies a first proxy component that is associated with the first remote shared service provider and is able to communicate with the first remote shared service provider using the first messaging model [col. 6, line 54 "the foreign ORB builds a proxy object"; see col. 9, line 45 "configuration file" "In the initialization of the manager of proxy manager object depicted in FIG. 5, the registration of the proxy managers is dependent on hard coding within the configuration file."];

- when the first proxy component is not already instantiated within the first application, instantiating the first proxy component [col. 6, line 54 "the foreign ORB builds a proxy object"];

- sending a message to the first proxy component requesting that the first proxy component send the first message to the

first remote shared service provider using the first messaging model [e.g., see col. 5, line 60: "By use of the present invention, the ORBs are able to pass a call from one object in a first address space implemented according to a first ORB to a target object in a second address space implemented according to a second ORB."; see also discussion col. 11, line 2]; and

- receiving a response from the first remote shared service provider via the first proxy component, and notifying the first application of the received response, so that an application can communicate with any of the remote shared service providers using any of the multiple messaging models via a local messaging component that identifies and uses a proxy component able to communicate with a specified remote shared service provider using a specified messaging model [see col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."].

As per independent claims 35 & 36:
These claims are rejected for the same reasons detailed above in the rejection of independent claim 1, and also for the following additional reasons:

Campagnoni teaches a computing device for executing applications to communicate with remote shared service providers using multiple messaging models, each remote shared service provider having for each of the multiple messaging models [**Campagnoni** teaches a preferred embodiment that uses the SOM messaging model, however **Campagnoni** also discloses and alternative embodiment that allows objects to communication with foreign ORBs, see discussion col. 6, beginning line 14] a distinct associated proxy component able to communicate with

that remote shared service provider using that messaging model, comprising:

- a first application capable of, during execution, notifying a local messaging component [i.e., proxy manager, col. 6] able to communicate with each of the associated proxies to send a specified first message to a specified first remote shared service provider using a specified first messaging model [e.g., see "Clients typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion]; and

- the local messaging component capable of, during execution, retrieving configuration information for the first remote shared service provider that identifies a first proxy component that is associated with the first remote shared service provider and is able to communicate with the first remote shared service provider using the first messaging model, instantiating the first proxy component [col. 6, line 54 "the foreign ORB builds a proxy object"; see col. 9, line 45 "configuration file" "In the initialization of the manager of proxy manager object depicted in FIG. 5, the registration of the proxy managers is dependent on hard coding within the configuration file."], and

- sending a message to the first proxy component requesting that the first proxy component send the first message to the first remote shared service provider using the first messaging model [e.g., see col. 5, line 60: "By use of the present invention, the ORBs are able to pass a call from one object in a first address space implemented according to a first ORB to a target object in a second address space implemented according to a second ORB."; see also discussion col. 11,

line 2].

As per independent claims 37 & 53:

Campagnoni teaches a method in a computer system for an executing application to communicate with remote services using multiple messaging models, each remote service having for each of the multiple messaging models an associated proxy able to communicate using that messaging model, the method comprising:

- for each of multiple of the remote services, notifying a local messaging service [i.e., proxy manager, col. 6] to send a message to the remote service using a specified messaging model [e.g., see "Clients typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion; see discussion of processing of "different ORBs" col. 7, beginning line 10; See discussion of foreign ORBs, col. 6, line 13: "With the embodiment shown in the figure, objects written to ORB 101 may communicate with objects written to foreign ORBs. In alternative embodiments, objects written to other ORBs communicate with objects foreign to those ORBs, complementary sets of a manager of proxy managers and a plurality proxy manager objects exist. Each ORB would have a set if that ORB is to have the interoperability with objects written to foreign ORBs, the set would have a proxy manager object for each foreign ORB with which it wants to communicate."];

- under control of the local messaging service, identifying the associated proxy for the remote service that is able to communicate with the remote service using the specified messaging model [e.g., see "Clients typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which

services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion]; and

- sending the message to the identified proxy for communication to the remote service using the specified messaging model [see col. 6, line 63: "Whenever a method is invoked on the proxy object 109, it is received by the ORB corresponding to that proxy object 109 and handled in an appropriate fashion. The "appropriate fashion" is in a manner consistent with the particular ORB implementation, for example, the way that particular ORB implementation processes requests."]; and

- receiving a response to the sent message from the local messaging service in accordance with the specified messaging model [see col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."].

As per independent claim 56:
This claim is rejected for the same reasons detailed above in the rejection of the preceding independent claims, and also for the following additional reasons:
Campagnoni teaches a computing device for executing an application to communicate with remote services using multiple messaging models, each remote service having for each of the multiple messaging models an associated proxy able to communicate using that messaging model, comprising:

- an application capable of, for each of multiple of the remote services, notifying a local messaging service [i.e., proxy manager, col. 6] to send a message to the remote service using a specified messaging model [e.g., see "Clients typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for

other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion; See discussion of foreign ORBs, col. 6, line 13: "With the embodiment shown in the figure, objects written to ORB 101 may communicate with objects written to foreign ORBs. In alternative embodiments, objects written to other ORBs communicate with objects foreign to those ORBs, complementary sets of a manager of proxy managers and a plurality proxy manager objects exist. Each ORB would have a set if that ORB is to have the interoperability with objects written to foreign ORBs, the set would have a proxy manager object for each foreign ORB with which it wants to communicate."]; and

- the local messaging service capable of identifying the associated proxy for the remote service that is able to communicate with the remote service using the specified messaging model, and of sending the message to the identified proxy for communication to the remote service using the specified messaging model [e.g., see "proxy manager" and associated discussion col. 6, lines 6 – 60, particularly the procedure by which the proxy manager resolves a foreign object reference beginning col. 6, line 48].

As per independent claim 57:
This claim is rejected for the same reasons detailed above in the rejection of the preceding independent claims, and also for the following additional reasons:

Campagnoni teaches a computing device for executing an application to communicate with remote services using multiple messaging models, each remote service having for each of the multiple messaging models an associated proxy able to communicate using that messaging model, comprising:

- means for, for each of multiple of the remote services, notifying a local messaging service to send a message to the

remote service using a specified messaging model and receiving a response to the sent message from the local messaging service in accordance with the specified messaging model [e.g., see "Clients typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion; See discussion of foreign ORBs, col. 6, line 13:

"With the embodiment shown in the figure, objects written to ORB 101 may communicate with objects written to foreign ORBs. In alternative embodiments, objects written to other ORBs communicate with objects foreign to those ORBs, complementary sets of a manager of proxy managers and a plurality proxy manager objects exist. Each ORB would have a set if that ORB is to have the interoperability with objects written to foreign ORBs, the set would have a proxy manager object for each foreign ORB with which it wants to communicate."]; and

- means for identifying the associated proxy for the remote service that is able to communicate with the remote service using the specified messaging model, and for sending the message to the identified proxy for communication to the remote service using the specified messaging model [e.g., see "proxy manager" and associated discussion col. 6, lines 6 – 60, particularly the procedure by which the proxy manager resolves a foreign object reference beginning col. 6, line 48; see also col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."].

As per independent claims 58 & 66:
These claims are rejected for the same reasons detailed above in the rejection of the preceding independent claims, and also for the following additional reasons:

Campagnoni teaches a method in a computer system for sending messages to remote applications using multiple messaging models, each remote application having at least one associated proxy able to communicate using at least one of the messaging models, the method comprising:

- for each of multiple of the remote applications, receiving a request from a client to send a message to the remote application using a specified messaging model [e.g., see "Clients typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion];

- retrieving information associated with the remote application that identifies at least one proxy associated with the remote application [col. 6, line 54 "the foreign ORB builds a proxy object"];

- when one of the identified proxies is able to communicate using the specified messaging model, sending the message to that one proxy for communication to the remote application using the specified messaging model [e.g., see "Clients typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion; See discussion of foreign ORBs, col. 6, line 13: "With the embodiment shown in the figure, objects written to ORB 101 may communicate with objects written to foreign ORBs. In alternative embodiments, objects written to other ORBs communicate with objects foreign to those ORBs, complementary sets of a manager of proxy managers and a plurality proxy manager objects exist. Each ORB would have a set if that ORB is to have the interoperability with objects written to foreign ORBs, the set would have a

proxy manager object for each foreign ORB with which it wants to communicate."];
and

- providing a response to the client in accordance with the sending of the message using the specified messaging model [see col. 6, line 63: "Whenever a method is invoked on the proxy object 109, it is received by the ORB corresponding to that proxy object 109 and handled in an appropriate fashion. The "appropriate fashion" is in a manner consistent with the particular ORB implementation, for example, the way that particular ORB implementation processes requests."]; and

- when none of the identified proxies are able to communicate using the specified messaging model, selecting one of the identified proxies that is able to communicate using a messaging model distinct from the specified messaging model [see col. 6, line 45: "At some point, an ORB will receive an object identifier which it does not recognize as originating within its domain. To resolve the foreign object reference, the ORB makes a call on the manager of proxy managers object 115. The manager of proxy manager 115 polls the available proxy manager objects 105-107 for the other ORBs to find one which recognizes the object reference. When the correct proxy manager 107 is found, the proxy manager 107 associated with the foreign ORB builds a proxy object 109 for the target object 111 and returns a pointer 117 to the manager of proxy managers 115."];

- sending the message to the selected proxy for communication to the remote application using the distinct messaging model [e.g., see "proxy manager" and associated discussion col. 6, lines 6 – 60, particularly the procedure by which the proxy manager resolves a foreign object reference beginning col. 6, line 48; see also col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."]; and

- providing a response to the client in such a manner as to simulate using the specified messaging model for the sending of the message [see col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the

results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."].

As per independent claim 67:
This claim is rejected for the same reasons detailed above in the rejection of the independent claims 58 & 66 above, and also for the following additional reasons:

Campagnoni teaches the use of multiple proxy copies each capable of receiving a sent message for communication to one of the remote applications and communicating the received message to the one remote application [e.g., see col. 7, line 9: "If the local ORB does not recognize the object identifier, the object is a foreign object belonging to a different ORB. In step 205, the object identifier is passed to the manager of the proxy managers. The manager of proxy managers iteratively queries the installed proxy managers, step 207, for recognition of the object identifier, step 209, until a proxy manager recognizes the object identifier or all the proxy managers have been polled, step 211. The proxy manager which recognizes the object identifier creates the proxy object and returns a pointer to the manager of proxy managers, step 213."].

As per independent claim 69:
This claim is rejected for the same reasons detailed above in the rejection of the independent claims above, and also for the following additional reasons:

Campagnoni teaches a method in a computer system for an executing application to communicate with remote services using multiple messaging models, the executing application having a local messaging service able to communicate with each of the remote services using at least one of the multiple messaging models, the method comprising:

- for each of multiple of the remote services, receiving an indication to send a specified message to the remote service using a specified messaging model [e.g., see "Clients

typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion];

- notifying the local messaging service to send the message to the remote service using the specified messaging model [e.g., see "Clients typically request services by issuing requests. A request will normally include an object reference as well as values for other parameters in the request to denote a particular target object from which services are requested" col. 4, line 61, and associated discussion; See discussion of foreign ORBs, col. 6, line 13: "With the embodiment shown in the figure, objects written to ORB 101 may communicate with objects written to foreign ORBs. In alternative embodiments, objects written to other ORBs communicate with objects foreign to those ORBs, complementary sets of a manager of proxy managers and a plurality proxy manager objects exist. Each ORB would have a set if that ORB is to have the interoperability with objects written to foreign ORBs, the set would have a proxy manager object for each foreign ORB with which it wants to communicate."];

- under control of the local messaging service, determining whether the remote service supports communication using a messaging model that is compatible with the specified messaging model [e.g., see "proxy manager" and associated discussion col. 6, lines 6 – 60, particularly the procedure by which the proxy manager resolves a foreign object reference beginning col. 6, line 48; see also col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."];

- when the remote service does support the compatible messaging model communication, sending the message to the remote service using the compatible messaging model

[see col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."]; and

- receiving a response from the remote service in accordance with the compatible messaging model [see col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."]; and

- when the remote service does not support the compatible messaging model communication, sending the message to the remote service using a messaging model that is incompatible with the specified messaging model [e.g., see col. 10, line 46: " In response, the manager of proxy managers 515 queries the proxy managers 517, 519, 521 until it finds a proxy manager 521 which understands the foreign object reference. This proxy manager 521 creates the Universal Object Encapsulater proxy (UOE proxy) 523 through which communication into the target object 504 is accomplished."]; and

- simulating a response to the sent message in accordance with the specified messaging model [e.g., see col. 10, line 52:" A pointer to the UOE proxy is passed back to the ORB in the client machine which creates a client UOE proxy object 525 and a pointer to the requesting client object 502."]; and

- receiving a response to the sent message from the local messaging service in accordance with the specified messaging model [see col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."].

As per dependent claims 2-21, 24-34, 49-52, 59-63:

Campagnoni teaches a system for communication that enables interoperability with foreign ORBs where a proxy manager object exists for each foreign ORB [see discussion beginning col. 6, line 15]. **Campagnoni** teaches an interoperable method of object communication using first (known) and second (i.e., foreign) proxy components and messaging, as claimed[col. 6, line 39]:

> Processing of requests for remote objects within an ORB proceeds as usual until a foreign object is detected. That is, for native, but remote objects, proxy objects are built to handle communication across the network to target objects. Each object has associated with it an identifier which is unique to that object. The ORB requires the target object 's identifier to route a call to the target object. At some point, an ORB will receive an object identifier which it does not recognize as originating within its domain. To resolve the foreign object reference, the ORB makes a call on the manager of proxy managers object 115. The manager of proxy manager 115 polls the available proxy manager objects 105-107 for the other ORBs to find one which recognizes the object reference. When the correct proxy manager 107 is found, the proxy manager 107 associated with the foreign ORB builds a proxy object 109 for the target object 111 and returns a pointer 117 to the manager of proxy managers 115. The manager of proxy managers 115 returns a copy of the pointer 117 to the calling routine 119. The calling routine 119 then wraps the object pointer with the appropriate object reference abstraction. The proxy manager encapsulates the pointer according to the presentation that the entity should take within other data structures, APIs, objects and so forth. Whenever a method is invoked on the proxy object 109, it is received by the ORB corresponding to that proxy object 109 and handled in an appropriate fashion. The "appropriate fashion" is in a manner consistent with the particular ORB implementation, for example, the way that particular ORB implementation processes requests.

As per dependent claim 38:

Campagnoni teaches, under control of each of the proxies: receiving the sent message from the local messaging service and sending the message to the remote service in a manner specific to the remote service [see col. 9, line 41: "In step 457, the target object receives the client's request, executes the request, and returns the results back to the ORB. The proxy object returns the results of the target object's actions to the client."].

As per dependent claim 39:

Campagnoni teaches each of the proxies are object instances, and including creating each of the proxies when the proxy is first

identified [see proxy object discussion col. 6].

As per dependent claim 40:
Campagnoni teaches the sending of the messages to the proxies includes invoking interface methods of the instances [see proxy object discussion col. 6].

As per dependent claim 41:
Campagnoni teaches at least one of the proxies has distinct interface methods corresponding to each of the messaging models with which the proxy is able to communicate, and wherein the sent message to those proxies identifies the specified messaging model based on selecting the interface method of the proxy that corresponds to the specified messaging model as the interface method to be invoked [col. 7, line 9: "If the local ORB does not recognize the object identifier, the object is a foreign object belonging to a different ORB. In step 205, the object identifier is passed to the manager of the proxy managers."]

As per dependent claim 42:
Campagnoni teaches the sent messages to the proxies identify the specified messaging model based on specifying a parameter (i.e., equivalent to an "object identifier") during the invoking of the interface method such that the specified parameter corresponds to the specified messaging model [e.g., see col. 7, line 12:" The manager of proxy managers iteratively queries the installed proxy managers, step 207, for recognition of the object identifier, step 209, until a proxy manager recognizes the object identifier or all the proxy managers have been polled, step 211."].

As per dependent claim 43:
Campagnoni teaches the local messaging service is an object instance [col. 6, line 7 "local proxy objects"].

As per dependent claim 44:
Campagnoni teaches the notifying of the local messaging service includes invoking an interface method of the local messaging

service instance [col. 6, lines 5-21, see proxy objects and proxy manager object discussion].

As per dependent claim 45:
Campagnoni teaches the local messaging service instance has distinct interface methods corresponding to each of the messaging models with which the local messaging service is able to communicate, and wherein the specifying of a messaging model during the notifying of the local messaging service is based on selecting the interface method of the local messaging service that corresponds to the specified messaging model as the interface method to be invoked [col. 6, see ORB, proxy objects and proxy manager object discussion].

As per dependent claim 46:
See the rejection of claim 42.

As per dependent claim 54:
Campagnoni teaches the computer-readable medium is a data transmission medium transmitting a generated data signal containing the contents [col. 4, lines 20-31, i.e., "computer instructions 48-52 resident in random access memory 24"].

As per dependent claim 55:
Campagnoni teaches the computer-readable medium is a memory of a computer system ["random access memory 24", col. 4, line 21].

Allowable Subject Matter:

Dependent claims 22, 23, 47, 48, 64, 65 appear to be allowable over the prior art of record if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, subject to the results of a final search and consideration of the IDS material requested on page 2 of this office action.

These claims stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

The prior art of record does not teach nor fairly suggest the use of the "multiple action handler components" or "view handler components" operatively coupled as claimed when the aforementioned terms are properly construed as definitions [see page 6, instant specification]. The words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a <u>clear definition</u> in the specification. <u>In re Zletz</u>, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 68 appears to be allowable over the prior art of record, subject to the results of a final search and consideration of the IDS material requested on page 2 of this office action, as the prior art of record does not teach nor fairly suggest the use of the "multiple action handler components" or "view handler components" operatively coupled as claimed when the aforementioned terms are properly construed as definitions, *supra*.

Prior Art not relied upon:

Please refer to the references listed on the attached PTO-892 which are not relied upon in the claim rejections detailed above.

How to Contact the Examiner:

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to
St. John Courtenay III, J.D., M.B.A., whose voice telephone number is **(703) 308-5217.** A voice mail service is also available at this number.
Normal Flex work schedule: M – F   7:30 AM - 4:00 PM

- **All responses sent by U.S. Mail should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Patent Customers advised to FAX communications to the USPTO

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/faxnotice.pdf

Effective Oct. 15, 2003, ALL patent application correspondence transmitted by FAX must be directed to the new PTO central FAX number:

**NEW PTO CENTRAL FAX NUMBER:
703-872-9306**

- Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC 2100 Group receptionist: (703) 305-3900.**

**Please direct inquiries regarding fees, paper matching, and other issues not involving the Examiner to:
Technical Center 2100 CUSTOMER SERVICE: 703 306-5631**

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) is available online at: http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/index.html

ST. JOHN COURTENAY III
PRIMARY EXAMINER